

EXHIBIT A

<p align="center"><u>DAPs Motions in Limine</u></p> <p align="center">All filed as Dkt No. 3558</p>	<p align="center"><u>IPP Position</u></p>
No. 1: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Plaintiffs’ Competitive Intelligence Practices	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(Issue Requires Separate IPP Trial)</i></p>
No. 2: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Downstream Pass-Through	<p align="center">IPPs Oppose DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(Issue Requires Separate IPP Trial)</i></p>
No. 3: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Plaintiffs’ Private Label CRT Products	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(Issue Calls for Separate IPP Trial)</i></p>
No. 4: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Plaintiffs’ Purported “Market Power”	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(Issue Calls for Separate IPP Trial)</i></p>
No. 5: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Plaintiffs’ Ability to Seek Treble Damages and Attorneys’ Fees and Costs	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3538)</i></p>
No. 6: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Other Actions and Settlements in this MDL	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(See Similar IPP Motions, Dkt. Nos. 3551-52)</i></p>
No. 7: Motion to Exclude Argument That Plaintiffs’ Claims are Barred Because They Arise from Foreign Commerce	<p align="center">IPPs Take No Position on DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(At this Time)</i></p>
No. 8: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Plaintiffs’ Alleged Failure to Mitigate Their Damages	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3545)</i></p>
No. 9: Motion to Exclude Live Witnesses from Testifying in Defendants’ Case-In-Chief Who Were Not Made Available for Live Testimony in Plaintiffs’ Case-In-Chief	<p align="center">IPPs Support DAP Motion</p> <p align="center"><i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3549)</i></p>

No. 10: Motion to Exclude Evidence or Argument regarding Incomplete Pass-Through of Overcharges through Affiliate Entities	IPPs Oppose DAP Motion <i>(Issue Supports Separate IPP Trial)</i>
No. 11: Motion to Establish the Preclusive Effect of, or in the Alternative Admit, the Decision of the European Commission	IPPs Take No Position At This Time <i>(MIL No. 11 Briefing on Separate Track)</i>
No. 12: Motion to Exclude Percipient Witnesses, Except for One Party Representative, From the Courtroom Unless They Are Testifying	DAPs Will Withdraw This Motion Pursuant to Stipulation <i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3548)</i>
No. 13: Motion to Exclude Argument or Evidence Regarding Purportedly Pro-Competitive Justifications For Defendants' Agreements Regarding CRT Price, Supply, Production, or Customers	IPPs Support DAP Motion <i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3554)</i>
No. 14: Motion to Exclude References to and Evidence of Defendants' Non-Indictment	IPPs Support DAP Motion <i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3544)</i>
No. 15: Motion to Admit Testimony of Summary Witness	IPPs Support DAP Motion
No. 16: Motion to Exclude Evidence of or References to the Retailer Plaintiffs Purchasing Finished Products Containing CRTs from Plaintiff ViewSonic or Plaintiff Sharp	IPPs Support DAP Motion <i>(Issue Calls for Separate IPP Trial)</i>
No. 17: Motion to Exclude Evidence of or References to ViewSonic's Purchasing Team Moving Abroad After The Purchases at Issue in This Case Were Made	IPPs Support DAP Motion <i>(Issue Calls for Separate IPP Trial)</i>
No. 18: Motion to Exclude References to the Current Financial Condition of Any of the Named Plaintiffs	DAPs Will Withdraw This Motion Pursuant to Stipulation <i>(See Similar IPP Motion, Dkt. No. 3548)</i>